DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 632 FL 018 097

AUTHOR Prince, Ellen F.
TITLE Yiddish WH-Clauses, Subject-Postponing, and Topicalization.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 15p.; In Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (5th, Philadelphia, PA, September 30-October 2, 1988). The complete Proceedings are available from the Department of Linguistics, Ohio State University Columbus.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Grammar; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; Models; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Yiddish
IDENTIFIERS *Relative Clauses; Topicality; *Wh Clauses

ABSTRACT

An analysis of two different WH-clause types (relative clauses and free relatives/indirect questions) in Yiddish investigates the acceptability of a gap in the first position. A model is presented that accounts for the differences between the two by positing three constraints on their formation. It is then argued that either these constraints follow directly from discourse facts about the function of syntactic form, in which case they need not be stated at all in the syntax, or they are grammaticizations of those discourse facts. More specifically, it is argued that patterns result from certain interactions of the three types of WH-clauses with subject postponing and topicalization, and that these interactions reflect the discourse functions of the constructions in question. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309632

Yiddish WH- Clauses, Subject-Postposing, and Topicalization

by

Ellen F. Prince

from

Proceedings of the Fifth

EASTERN STATES CONFERENCE ON LINGUISTICS

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

September 30 - October 2, 1988

Joyce Powers and Kenneth de Jong
Editors
The Ohio State University

FL018097

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph, B. D.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ESCOL '88 403-415

YIDDISH WH-CLAUSES, SUBJECT-POSTPOSING, AND TOPICALIZATION*

Ellen F. Prince
University of Pennsylvania

0. Introduction.

Despite some discussion in recent years of Yiddish Wh-clauses (Lowenstamm 1977, Travis 1984, Diesing, To appear), a problem remains concerning the difference between (headed) relative clauses (RCs), on the one hand, and free relatives/indirect questions (FR/IQs), on the other, with respect to the acceptability of a gap in first position. Consider 1-3:

(1) RC with subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a. der melamed vos [e] iz beser far ir (iz beser far mir).
the teacher that [e] is better for her (is better for me)
b.*der melamed vos es iz beser far ir (iz beser far mir).
the teacher that it is better for her (is better for me)

(2) FR with subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a.*ver [e] iz beser far ir (iz beser far mir).
who [e] is better for her (is better for me)
b. ver es iz beser far ir (iz beser far mir).
who(ever) it is better for her (is better for me)
'Who(ever) is better for her is better for me.'

(3) IQ with subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a.*(ikh hob zi gefregt) ver [e] iz beser far ir.
(I have her asked) who [e] is better for her.
b. (ikh hob zi gefregt) ver es iz beser far ir.
(I have her asked) who it is better for her.
'I asked her who was better for her.'

That is, if a subject is extracted (and nothing is topicalized), we find a gap in first position in RCs but an expletive es 'it' in FR/IQs.

In addition, note that, if a non-subject is extracted and nothing else is in first/topicalized position, then the expletive is required in all three types of WH-clauses, as seen in 4-6:

(4) RC with non-subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a.*der yid vos [e] kenen ale dayne khaverim (vet maskim zayn).
the guy that [e] know all your friends (will agree be)
b. der yid vos es kenen ale dayne khaverim (vet maskim zayn).
the guy that it know all your friends (will agree be)
'The guy that all your friends know will agree.'

(5) FR with non-subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a.*(ikh vel farbetn) vemen [e] kenen ale dayne khaverim.
(I will invite) whom [e] know all your friends
b. (ikh vel farbetn) vemen es kenen ale dayne khaverim.
(I will invite) whom it know all your friends
'I will invite whom(ever) all your friends know.'

(6) IQ with non-subject extracted and empty 1st position:
a.*(ikh hob im gefregt) vemen [e] kenen ale dayne khaverim.
(I have him asked) whom [e] know all your friends
b. (ikh hob im gefregt) vemen es kenen ale dayne khaverim.
(I have him asked) whom it know all your friends
'I asked him whom all your friends knew.'[1]

Finally, if a non-subject is topicalized and the subject is extracted, there is no expletive in any of the three clause-types, as seen in 7:

(7)a. RC with subject extracted and Topicalization:
(zi vil) dem vos far ir iz beser,
(she wants) that that for her is better
'She wants the one that is better for her,'
b. FR with subject extracted and Topicalization:
ver far ir iz beser, (dem vil zi nit),
who for her is better, (that wants she not)
'Whoever is better for her, she doesn't want him,'
c. IQ with subject extracted and Topicalization:
(ikh hob zi gefregt) ver far ir iz beser.
(I have her asked) who for her is better
'I asked her who was better for her.'

This paper proposes an analysis of such clauses that accounts for these and other relevant facts by positing three constraints on their formation. It is then argued that either these constraints follow directly from discourse facts about the function of syntactic form, in which case they need not be stated at all in the syntax, or else they are grammaticizations of those discourse facts. In either case, then, we see why the facts should be as they are. More specifically, I shall argue that the distribution of stars in 1-7 results from certain interactions of the three types of WH-clauses with Subject-Postposing and Topicalization and that these interactions reflect the discourse functions of the constructions in question. Before considering discourse, however, we must first look at the syntax of Yiddish in some more detail.

1. Syntax of declarative clauses.

I shall assume an analysis of Yiddish which is due in the main to David Perlmutter, in substance and spirit if not in terminology. According to this analysis, subjects of declarative clauses originate in first/topicalized position, or 'Initial field', as in 8:

(8) Canonical: a yid geyt farbay oyf-n gas.
a guy goes PRT on-the street
'A guy passes by on the street.'

If a non-subject is topicalized, the subject minimally moves to the post-Infl position, or 'Middle field', as in 9:[2]

(9) Topicalization: oyf-n gas geyt a yid farbay.
on-the street goes a guy PRT

Independently, the subject may be postposed to the end of the VP, or to 'Final field'. If it is, and if nothing is topicalized, then

expletive es occurs in Initial field, as in 10: if some non-subject is topicalized, then of course that constituent occurs in Initial field, as in 11:[3]

(10) Subject-Postposing: es geyt farbay oyf-n gas a yid.
it goes PRT on-the street a guy

(11) Top. + Subj.-Postp: oyf-n gas geyt farbay a yid.
on-the street goes PRT a guy [4]

2. Constraints on declarative WH-clauses.

The facts of RCs and FR/IQs follow from the analysis outlined above, given the general constraints presented in 12 and the special constraints presented in 13:

(12)a. In WH-movement of (initial) subjects, the resulting trace is properly governed under antecedent-government.
b. In Subject-Postposing, the resulting Empty Category is not properly governed.
c. Iff an Empty Category is not properly governed, insertion of an expletive is obligatory.

(13)a. Yiddish RCs: Ban on Postposing
No extracted subject in RCs may have first undergone Postposing.
b. Yiddish FR/IQs: Obligatory Postposing
All extracted subjects in FR/IQs must first have undergone Postposing.
c. Yiddish RCs and FR/IQs: Ban on Topicalization
No constituent extracted by WH-movement may have first undergone Topicalization.

The story goes as follows. In 1a, the subject would be extracted from its original Initial-field position, leaving a properly A'-bound trace, i.e. a gap. In contrast, 1b would be derived by Subject-Postposing, leaving an unbound trace, i.e. an expletive, with the subject then extracted from postposed position. The impossibility of 1b would then be due to the violation of 13a, the ban on extracting postposed subjects in RCs. The ungrammatical FR in 2a and IQ in 3a, with Initial-field gaps, would be derived by extracting Initial-field subjects, thus violating the Subject-Postposing requirement of 13b. Conversely, the grammatical 2b and 3b would be derived by extracting postposed subjects, the postposing leaving behind an unbound trace and hence the expletive. The ungrammatical 4a, 5a, and 6a would be derived from Subject-Postposing plus Topicalization of the object prior to the extraction of the topicalized object, violating the ban on extracting topicalized constituents in 13c. In contrast, the grammatical 4b, 5b, and 6b would be derived simply via Subject-Postposing without Topicalization of the object prior to the extraction of the object. Likewise, the clauses in 7, involving Topicalization of a non-subject and extraction of the subject, are correctly predicted to be grammatical.

Such an account, then, sees the expletive in FR/IQs like 2b and 3b as being a reflex not of any special subtype of WH-movement but rather as the reflex of Subject-Postposing, identical to the expletive in

clauses like IQ. I shall now give some syntactic evidence for this view.

2.1. Evidence for the grouping of FR/IQ vs. RC.

The first issue that deserves some comment is the patterning together of FRs and IQs, in contrast to RCs. Although FRs have often been seen as akin to RCs, there is ample evidence that, formally at least, they are closer to IQs. See for example the many arguments given for at least a certain subset of English FRs in Richardson 1988. For Yiddish, the case is even stronger than for English, for all FRs, as the facts in 1-3 suggest (cf. Diesing, To appear). In addition, we find several other motivations for such a classification.

First, the equivalents of WH-words in Yiddish show a clear alignment of FRs with questions and not with RCs, as seen in Lowenstamm 1977. In particular, RCs alone may have an invariant complementizer vos 'that', not inflected for number, gender, or case. In addition, there are pronouns for all three types of WH-clauses and, where they differ, the FR pronouns are identical to the IQ pronouns, which are the same as ordinary (direct) question pronouns and different from the corresponding RC pronouns, as illustrated in 14:

(14)a. RC: der yid velkher/*ver ligt dortn (iz mayn khaver).
the guy who/*who lies there (is my friend)
b. FR: ver/*velkher es ligt dortn (iz mayn khaver).[5]
who/*who it lies there (is my friend)
c. IQ: (ikh vil visn) ver/*velkher es ligt dortn.
(I want know) who/*who it lies there
d. Dir. ques.: ver/*velkher ligt dortn?
who/*who lies there?

Second, Yiddish permits resumptive pronouns in RCs but not in FRs, IQs, or direct questions, as shown in 15:

(15)a. RC: der yid vos er ligt dortn (iz mayn khaver).
the guy that he lies there (is my friend)
b. FR:*ver er ligt dortn (iz mayn khaver).
who he lies there (is my friend)
c. IQ:*(ikh vil visn) ver er ligt dortn.
(I want know) who he lies there
d. Direct question:*ver ligt er dortn?
who lies he there?

Third, Yiddish has an enclitic 'intensifier' particle -zhe that cliticizes onto WH-pronouns in FRs, IQs, and direct questions but not onto WH-pronouns in RCs, as shown in 16:

(16)a. RC:*der yid vos-zhe/velkher-zhe ligt dortn (zol peygern!)
the guy that-PRT/who-PRT lies there (shall croak)
*'The guy who the hell is lying there should croak!'
b. FR: ver-zhe es ligt dortn (zol peygern!)
who-PRT it lies there (shall croak)
'Whoever the hell is lying there should croak!'
c. IQ: (ikh vil visn) ver-zhe es ligt dortn!
(I want know) who-PRT it lies there
'I want to know who the hell is lying there!'

d. Direct question: ver-zhe ligt dortn?
who-PRT lies there
'Who the hell is lying there?'

Thus there seems to be good reason to take FRs and IQs as forming a natural class on formal grounds, different from RCs, at least in Yiddish.

2.2. Evidence from agreement for the constraints in 13.

In Yiddish, as in German, the verb agrees with the subject in person and number. However, in the colloquial language, there is some variation in that a third-person plural subject may occur with a singular verb. In the more than 9000 clauses in one text, Olsvanger's Royte pomerantsn, such singular agreement with phonologically realized third-person plural subjects occurs about 8% of the time (54/672). However, 100% of the instances of singular verbs with plural subjects involve subjects that are postposed.[6] In fact, if we consider just third-person plural postposed subjects, the lack of agreement turns out to be much less rare, occurring about 40% of the time. That is, we find the pattern shown in 17:

(17)a. es zenen/iz gekumen di balebatim.
it are/is come the elders 'The elders came [PLU/SG].'
b. es zenen/*iz di balebatim gekumen.
it are/*is the elders come
c. di balebatim zenen/*iz gekumen.
the elders are/*is come

Of relevance to the issue at hand is the fact that this text also contains one third person singular verb with a third person plural subject which is not phonologically realized, shown in 18:

(18) (...vet men oys-koylenen ale yidn,)
(...will one PRT-slaughter all Jews,)
vifl es gefint zikh in shtetl.
how-many it finds REFL in village
'...so they'll slaughter all the Jews, however many is found in the village.' (RP:220)

The appositive FR in 18 has an extracted subject, vifl 'however many', that must be understood as plural but the verb gefint 'finds' is singular. This follows from the agreement pattern discussed above only if the subject has been extracted from postposed position.

2.3. Evidence from split-vifl for the constraints in 13.

Yiddish has certain split-constituent phenomena, among which is the split vifl-constituent, as shown in 19b and 20b:

(19)a. vifl sidurim ikh hob gehat [e],
how-many prayer-books I have had [e],
(hobn di moln op-gefresn di kantn).
(have the moths PRT-eaten the edges)
'However many prayer books I had, the moths ate the edges.'
b. vifl ikh hob gehat [e] sidurim...
how-many I have had [e] prayer-books... (RP:228)

(20)a. vifl mer yener hot [e] geklapt in tir,
how-much more that has [e] banged in door,
(alts mer hot dos genumen dem yidn ba-n hartsn).
(all more has this taken the guy by-the heart)
'The more the other one banged on the door, the more it made the guy feel bad.'

b. vifl yener hot [e] mer geklapt in tir...
how-much that has [e] more banged in door... (RP:171)

That is, an entire vifl-phrase may be WH-moved, as in 19a and 20a, or simply the quantifier vifl may be WH-moved, leaving the X-bar constituent in situ, as in 19b and 20b. Thus the X-bar constituent in a split-vifl construction shows us the site from which the extraction took place. If we look at extracted subjects in split-vifl constructions, as in 21, we see that the X-bar constituent is in postposed position:

(21)a. vifl es iz geven [e] mentshn in shif,
how-many it is been [e] people in ship,
(zenen...dertrunken gevorn).
(are... drowned become)
'However many people were on the ship drowned.' (RP:112)

b. vifl es iz in ir geven [e] tsuker,
how-much it is in her been [e] sugar
(hot er arayn-geshotn tsu zikh in zekl).
(has he PRT-poured to REFL in bag)
'However much sugar was in it he poured into his bag.'
(RP:186)

Furthermore, if the quantifier is split and the X-bar constituent remains in Initial field, the sentence is ungrammatical, as in 22:

(22)a.*vifl [e] mentshn iz/zenen geven in shif...
how-many [e] people is/are been in ship...

b.*vifl [e] tsuker iz in ir geven...
how-much [e] sugar is in her been...

Of course these facts do not tell us that extracted subjects in FRs/IQs must be postposed, since 22 may be ungrammatical for independent reasons, but they tell us clearly that subjects in FRs/IQs may be extracted from postposed position.

In addition, note that the facts about agreement and those about split-vifl constructions cluster together as we would expect if subjects in such clauses are extracted from postposed position: the plural subject in 21a, clearly postposed, has singular agreement, as do the plural subjects in the split-vifl clauses in 23:

(23)a. (men darf tsuzamen-nemen)
(one must together-take)
vifl es iz do [e] shvigers in shtot...
how-many it is here [e] mothers-in-law in town...
'One must gather however many mothers-in-law there is-SG in town...' (RP:30)

b. vifl es iz geven [e] mentshn oyf-n feld
how-many it is been [e] people on-the field

(zenen oyf-getsitert gevorn)
(are PRT-trembled become)
'However many people was-SG on the field got-PL scared.'
(RP:248)

In sum then, we have fairly strong and very consistent evidence that subjects of FRs/IQs may be extracted from postposed position, that subjects of RCs may be extracted from Initial-field but not from postposed position, and we have no evidence that subjects of FRs/IQs may be extracted from Initial-field. I should now like to suggest some discourse reasons for why the situation should be this way.

3. Syntax and discourse.

3.1. The discourse functions of Subject-Postposing.

Let us first consider the discourse functions of Subject-Postposing in Yiddish. Elsewhere (Prince, To appear), I have presented quantitative evidence based on a study of naturally-occurring discourse that subjects in Yiddish may be postposed when they do not refer to an entity that is currently under discussion, that is not in the current set of 'Forward-looking Centers', following Joshi and Weinstein 1981, Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein 1987. For example, 17a, with its postposed subject di balebatim 'the elders' is felicitous only in the situation where the elders have not yet been mentioned, at least not in the current sub-part of the discourse-model under construction. This explains the apparent ban on postposing definite pronouns (Zaretski 1929, Weinreich 1971, inter alia); consider 24 and 25:

(24)a.*hinter im iz gegangen er.
behind him is gone he
b. hinter im iz gegangen imitser (un hot a ruf geton...).
behind him is gone someone (and has a call done...)
'Someone walked in behind him and gave a call...' (RP:213)
(25)a.*...iz zikh meyashev er...
...is REFL ponder he...
b. (vi zey zitsn azoy un shpiln,)
(as they sit so and play)
iz zikh meyashev eyner (un krigt a popleksie un shtarbt.)
is REFL ponder one (and gets an apoplexy and dies)
'As they sit like that and play, one thinks it over and has apoplexy and dies.' (RP:59)

It goes without saying that definite pronoun subjects, as well as any other anaphoric NPs, occur felicitously in Initial-field and Middle-field.

Furthermore, note that a postposed subject may represent no entity at all, as in the nonreferential cases in 26:

(26)a. es iz nit geven keyn ort avek-tsu-leygn dem yidn shlofn.
it is not been no place PRT-to-lay the guy sleep
'There was no place to put the guy to sleep.' (RP:41)
b. es kumt vayter nit aroys keyn bilet.
it comes again not out no ticket
'Again no ticket comes out.' (RP:96)
c. es zol nit geshen...an umglik oyf eybike tsaytn.
it shall not happen...a misfortune on eternal times

'May no eternal misfortune occur.' (RP:248)

Now, if we turn to FRs/IQs, we see that the extracted constituent, whatever it may represent, is focal and, if it represents an entity at all, it certainly does not represent an entity already in the discourse-model. Thus, the subject of a FR/IQ with an extracted subject is, prior to extraction, the type of thing that could undergo Postposing. This would explain why 2b and 3b are possible: the extracted subject has been postposed prior to extraction, leaving the expletive in Initial field.

The question remains, however, why 2a and 3a, where the subject has been extracted from Initial field with a resulting gap, are impossible. That is, Subject-Postposing *may* occur felicitously when the subject does not represent an entity currently in the discourse-model, but it is not obligatory. For example, alongside of postposed subjects like those in 26, we find Initial-field subjects like 27a and 27b and Middle-field subjects like 27c:

(27)a. keyn ort tsu-m shlofn-iz nito.
no place to-the sleep is not-here
'There is no place to sleep.' (RP:41)

b. ober keyn bilet iz nit aroys-gekumen.
but no ticket is not PRT-come
'But no ticket came out.' (RP:96)

c. es zol ir keyn beyz nit geshen.
it shall her no evil not happen.
'May no evil befall it.' (RP:248)

In sum, given the discourse function of Subject-postposing and the nature of extracted subjects in FRs/IQs, we can see why such subjects may have been postposed, but we do not see why they must have been postposed. To answer that question, I believe we must look at when Yiddish speakers actually do exercise their option to postpose subjects.

3.2. Subject-postposing in different syntactic environments.

In the *Royte pomerantsn* corpus, it turns out that the option to postpose subjects is chosen at a different rate in different syntactic environments. In particular, it is chosen less frequently in main clauses than in subordinate clauses in general. And, within subordinate clauses, it is chosen less frequently in complement clauses than in adverbial clauses, RCs, FRs, or IQs.

To see that this is the case, we must look at those clauses which have subjects which clearly do not represent entities already in the discourse-model, since it is only with such subjects that it is clear that the option arises. First, it should be noted that such entities are highly unlikely to be represented as subjects in any position in any type of clause, but they are even less likely to be so represented in subordinate clauses than in main clauses, as seen in the figures in 28:

(28) Distribution of Brand-new subjects in different clause-types:

	Brand-new	Other	Total
Main:	576 (9.5%)	5462 (90.5%)	6038 (100%)
All subord.:	103 (7.0%)	1361 (93.0%)	1464 (100%)
Total:	679 (9.1%)	6823 (90.9%)	7502 (100%)
[Chi-square = 8.975; $p < 0.01$]			
Subordinate:			
Adverbial:	29 (5.5%)	495 (94.5%)	524 (100%)
Complement:	53(11.9%)	392 (88.1%)	445 (100%)
FR:	12 (7.5%)	149 (92.5%)	161 (100%)
IQ:	4 (2.3%)	167 (97.7%)	171 (100%)
RC:	5 (3.1%)	158 (96.9%)	163 (100%)

Interestingly, we find the highest occurrence of Brand-new subjects in complement clauses. Why this should be so is unclear; I note simply that the most common higher verbs are verbs of saying, long known to permit main-clause phenomena under them (Emonds 1976). Even counting complement clauses as subordinate, however, we find that the main/subordinate split is significant at the 0.01 level. Now let us see in what position in the clause these Brand-new subjects occur. The figures are presented in 29:

(29) Position of Brand-new subject in different clause-types:

	Init./Mid.	Postposed	Total
Main:	232 (44%)	294 (56%)	526 (100%)
Subordinate:	30 (35%)	56 (65%)	86 (100%)
Total:	262 (43%)	350 (57%)	612 (100%)
[Chi-square = 2.568; $p < .020$; not significant]			
Subordinate:			
Adverbial:	16 (57%)	12 (43%)	28 (100%)
Complement:	14 (30%)	32 (70%)	46 (100%)
FR:	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)
IQ:	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
RC:	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Total WH-:	0 (0%)	12 (100%)	12 (100%)
[WH- vs. other Subord.: Chi-square = 7.471; $p < 0.01$]			
[WH- vs. Main: Chi-square = 9.306; $p < 0.01$]			
[WH- vs. all other: Chi-square = 9.161; $p < 0.01$]			

The numbers in 29 are smaller than those in 28 since those clauses in which the position of the subject is ambiguous between Middle field and Postposed were omitted, e.g. 30:

(30)a. ...antkegn undzer hoyz voynt a yunger ofitser.
...opposite our house lives a young officer (RP:31)

b. (ze ikh) az in mayn bet ligt a sheyne shikse.
(see I) that in my bed lies a pretty gentile-FEM
'So I see that a pretty gentile girl is lying in my bed.'
(RP:63)

c. ...in a vagon drite klas, vu es zitsn a sakh fonyes
...in a wagon third class, where it sit a lot Russians

mit undzere yidlekh
with our Jews-DIM
'...in a third-class car, where a lot of Russians are sitting with our little Jews...' (RP:199)

What is clear from the numbers in 29 is that Brand-new subjects are categorically postposed in RCs, FRs, and IQs. Of course, whether this is true in the language in general or whether in fact a larger corpus would have some tokens of non-postposed subjects in WH-clauses requires further study. At the least, however, we see a basis for the constraint in 13b. That which is extracted in FR/IQs is what I have been calling Brand-new, i.e. not referring to something already evoked in the discourse; by virtue of being Brand-new, either (a) it is extremely likely to be postposed or else (b) it must be postposed. This is a pragmatic fact, not a syntactic one. If (a) is the case, i.e. if it is only extremely likely to be postposed on pragmatic grounds, then the obligatoriness of postposing subjects in FR/IQs in 13b represents a syntactic constraint, but one which is now understandable as the grammaticization of a powerful pragmatic tendency. If it must be postposed on pragmatic grounds, then 13b simply follows from that and need not be stated in the syntax at all.

Now let us turn to RCs and the ban against postposing subjects to be extracted in RCs in 13a. Again, I believe that we may have here simply a reflex of the pragmatics of Preposing. In RCs, extracted constituents are coreferential with their heads. What they are exactly at the conceptual level is not entirely clear, but it is clear that they would not qualify as the sort of thing that gets postposed, since, whatever they are, they are already in the discourse model by virtue of the head having already been uttered. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, let me point out that, when an RC constituent that is coreferential with the head is not extracted but occurs as a resumptive pronoun, that pronoun is always definite, i.e. the type of pronoun that marks its referent as being already evoked in the discourse. Examples are given in 15a above and in 31:

(31)a. (in der zelbiker shtetl iz geven)
(in the same village is been)
a yid vos er iz geven a groyser lamdn un a gvir...
a guy that he is been a big scholar and a rich-man...
'In the same village was a guy that was a great scholar and a rich man.' (RP:178)

b. (er heybt im on redn a shidekh mit)
(he lifts him PRT talk a marriage with)
a yidene vos zi hot geheysn yente un
a Jewess that she has called Yenta and
vos me hot ir gerufn in shtetl "yente malekh-hamoveste",
that one has her called in village "Yenta angel-the-death",
'He begins to propose to him a marriage with an old bag who was called Yenta and whom they called in town "Yenta the Angel of Death". (RP:29)

c. (dos iz oykh a shlekhte krenk,)
(this is also a bad sickness)
di gelt vos zeyer har hot fun zey tsores.
the money-PL that their lord has from them troubles
'This is also a bad sickness, riches from which the owner

has troubles.' (RP:193)

Thus, though the referential status of both the head and the extracted item in RCs is not entirely clear, it is clear that the extracted item is not akin to NPs representing what have been called here 'Brand-new' information. Thus the ban in 13a against postposing a subject prior to extraction in an RC follows entirely from the discourse function of Subject-Postposing and need not be stated in the syntactic component.

3.3. WH-clauses and Topicalization.

Let us now finally turn to the last constraint, 13c, which states that no constituent extracted by WH-movement may have first undergone Topicalization, needed to rule out clauses like 4a, 5a, and 6a. In fact, the story for FRs/IQs seems intuitively straightforward. Although I have discussed only extracted subjects, clearly extracted non-subjects likewise must represent Brand-new information. Whether they must be postposed, or whether their base position already in Final field is sufficient, remains to be determined; what we would not expect, however, is their prior movement to Initial field, the position from which subjects may not be extracted and to which Topicalization would move them.

However, we are still left with the problem of ruling out Topicalization of extracted non-subjects in RCs. In fact, it seems that there is nothing conceptually incompatible between Topicalization and Relativization; consider 32:

(32)a. (A rich man is told he should write a will. He complains that he doesn't need to write a will because he has only)
eyn eyntsikn zun vos im gehert di gantse yerushe.
one single son that him belongs the whole inheritance
'...because he has just one son--to him the whole inheritance belongs.' (RP:167)

b. (...der ganev hot aroys-genumen kleyne zakhn fun)
(...the thief has PRT-taken small things from)
a tsimer vos in zelbikn tsimer zenen gelegn asignatsies
a room that in same room were lying cash[?]
mit hurlantn mit gold mit zilber...
with diamonds with gold with silver...
'...the thief took out small things from a room--in the same room were lying cash[?] and diamonds and gold and silver...' (RP:150)

In 32a, we find an RC where the item which is coreferential with the head, im 'him', is topicalized. Note, however, that it is not extracted; rather, it is realized as a resumptive pronoun. Similarly, in 32b, the coferential item in the RC is topicalized and not extracted, in this case being realized as a 'resumptive NP'. If these sentences are uttered out loud, a possible reason for the non-extraction suggests itself: topicalized constituents are never destressed. In 32a, the topicalized constituent gets secondary stress and in 32b it has a fall-rise contour. Perhaps then the ban on topicalizing constituents prior to extracting them in 13c is simply a reflex of a phonological requirement that items that are not destressed must have a lexical realization. If this is so, then clearly 13c is not a syntactic

constraint and 4a is ruled out because it is phonologically impossible.[7]

4. Conclusion.

In conclusion, I have tried to show that Yiddish WH-clauses can be accounted for if we admit certain constraints on them. These constraints appear at first blush to be highly arbitrary and ad hoc, the sort of constraints that are generally suspect from an acquisition point of view: how could a child ever acquire such ad hoc language-specific constraints? However, I then tried to show that, whatever they are, they are not arbitrary. At best, they are not syntactic constraints at all but merely reflexes of the pragmatics of various constructions, something that speakers definitely do acquire. At worst, they are syntactic, but then they are syntactic grammaticizations of what are very strong pragmatic tendencies. In either case, the grammar, autonomous though it is, turns out to be far more understandable when matters of discourse are taken into account.

FOOTNOTES

*I should like to thank Mascha Benya-Matz, Alejandro Meilijson, and Mordkhe Schaechter for their patient help with the data and D. Perlmutter, B. Santorini, A. Zaenen, J. Hoeksema, A.K. Joshi, and A.S. Kroch for their comments and suggestions/inspirations. This work was supported in part by NSF IRI84-10413-A02 (A.K. Joshi, Principal Investigator).

[1]Note that Yiddish has no sequence of tenses. The tense of the higher clause becomes the reference-time for the tense of lower clauses.

[2]The following may intervene between Infl and a Middle-field subject: the invariant reflexive zikh, pronouns, emphatic particles, PPs containing pronouns, and occasionally destressed complement NPs.

[3] PPs may be extraposed to follow Final-field subjects; object complement Ss always are. This is one reason I take the landing site for postposed subjects to be the end of the VP and not the S. Another reason is the behavior of postposed subjects in sentences with conjoined VPs: the subject always goes to the end of the first VP, as in i:

(i)a. eynmol oyf a khasene shteyt oyf a yid un zogt...
once on a wedding stands PRT a guy and says
'Once a guy stands up at a wedding and says...' (RP:26)

b. in tir hot im on-getrofn eyner un hot im gefregt....
in door has him PRT-found one and has him asked...
At the door someone met him and asked him... (RP:77)

[4]Note that, unlike German and Dutch, Yiddish is SVO and, unlike all other Continental Germanic languages, it obeys the Verb-second constraint in subordinate as well as main clauses (Diesing, To appear; Santorini 1988). All the grammatical main clause examples would also be grammatical as subordinate clauses.

[5]The FR, IQ, and direct question in 14 are grammatical with velkher when the understanding is 'which (of some evoked set)'. That is, velkher means who/what as a relative pronoun (RC) but 'which (of an evoked set)' as an interrogative pronoun (FR, IQ, direct question). Once again we see

FRs patterning with questions and not with RCs.

[6]I am excluding of course those cases where the subject is morphologically plural but semantically unitary, as in i:

(i) fuftsik kopikes iz dokh oykh gelt.
fifty kopeks is PRT also money (RP:68)

[7]There is, however, a potential problem with such an account in that there are certain verbs which take dative complements and where the occurrence of those datives in Initial field seems to have neither the understanding nor the prosody of Topicalization, at least not in any obvious way. However, such topicalized datives are still not extractable. Interestingly, the syntax of their cognate sentences in German is not at all clear, and, furthermore, in general dative arguments in Yiddish are very unlikely to be extracted, from any position. This area requires further study.

REFERENCES

Diesing, M. To appear. Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish. Natural language and linguistic theory.

Emonds, J. 1976. A transformational approach to English syntax: root, structure-preserving, and local transformations. NY: Academic Press.

Grosz, B., Joshi, A.K., and Weinstein, S. 1983. Providing a unified account of definite noun phrases in discourse. Proceedings of the 21st ACL Meeting. Pp. 44-50.

Grosz, B., Joshi, A.K, and Weinstein, S. 1987. Toward a computational theory of discourse interpretation. Ms.

Joshi, A.K. and Weinstein, S. 1981. Control of inference: role of some aspects of discourse structure-centering. Proc. IJCAI 81.

Lowenstamm, J. 1977. Relative clauses in Yiddish: a case for movement. Linguistic Analysis 3.3.197-216.

Olsvanger, I., ed. 1947. Royte pomerantsen. NY: Schocken Books.

Prince, E.F. To appear. The discourse function of Yiddish ES-sentences with postposed subjects. In Herzog, M. and Goldberg, D., eds. The field of Yiddish. Vol. 5.

Richardson, J. 1988. Wh-ever constructions. Univ. of Chicago. Ms.

Santorini, B. 1988. Against a uniform analysis of all Verb-second clauses. Presented at ESCOL, Univ. of Penn.

Travis, L. 1984. Parameters and effects of word order variation. MIT Ph.D. diss.

Weinreich, U. 1971. College Yiddish. 5th revised edition. NY: YIVO.

Zaretski, A. 1929. Yidishe gramatik. Vilna: Vilner Farlag.